

REMARKS

The following remarks are responsive to the Restriction Requirement of September 11, 2009.

Summary of the Office Action

At the time of the Office Action, claims 1–12 were pending. The Examiner required a restriction as indicated below:

Invention I	Claims 1–9	drawn to a client/server, classified in class 709, subclass 203
Invention II	Claims 10–12	drawn to network managing, classified in class 709, subclass 223

Applicants respectfully elect the Invention I claims, with traverse.

The Examiner distinguished the Invention I and Invention II claims as being related subcombinations that are usable together in a single combination. The distinguishing feature noted by the Examiner is that the Invention II claims have a separate utility based on the language in the Invention II claims, “a man-machine interface supplied by a synchronization client conveying information relating to the data to be synchronized”.

With regard to the reasons applied by the Examiner, Applicants note that although these claims are in different claim categories (claims 1–9 being directed to a system and claims 10–12 being directed to a method), they would not be related to each other as subcombinations (since a method cannot be a subcombination of a system and vice versa).

Nonetheless, other than “a man-machine interface supplied by a synchronization client conveying information relating to the data to be synchronized”, the remaining claim features in claims 1 and 10 overlap with one another. Given the extent of overlap, and the distinction of including the man-machine interface, Applicants respectfully assert that reason (d) cited by the Examiner “the prior art applicable to one invention would not likely be applicable to another invention” is incorrect, and that art that is pertinent to the Invention I claims would be relevant to the Invention II claims. Applicants further respectfully assert that any additional searching

In re Appln. of Le Lann et al.
Application No. 10/544,289
Response to Restriction Requirement of September 11, 2009

required by the Examiner relevant to the man-machine interface element would not be unduly burdensome.

Therefore, for the foregoing reasons, the Applicants respectfully request that all pending claims be considered in the present application, and that the Examiner withdraw the restriction requirement.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that the pending claims are in condition for allowance, and respectfully request reconsideration and timely allowance of the pending claims.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

/mark bergner/

Brian C. Rupp, Reg. No. 35,665
Mark Bergner, Reg. No. 45,877
DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP
191 N. Wacker Drive, Suite 3700
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1698
(312) 569-1000 (telephone)
(312) 569-3000 (facsimile)
Customer No.: 08968

Date: October 9, 2009

CH01/ 25404542.1